

**REMARKS**

Claims 1- 11 and 13-20 are now pending in the application. Claims 1-11 and 13-16 stand rejected. Claim 12 has been cancelled. Claims 17-20 have been withdrawn. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 13-15 have been amended, as set forth above, to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that Applicant regards as the invention. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests that the §112 rejection of claims 13-15 be withdrawn.

**REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1-2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Hughes et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,706). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended Claim 1 recites, "An integrated telephone system adapted to be housed in a seat of a mobile platform, the system comprising; a housing; a first terminal supported on said housing, said first terminal providing an electrical connection point for a telephone handset of said system and a first communication link to a remote transmitter of the mobile platform; and a second terminal supported on said housing at a location readily accessible by a first user, said second terminal providing an electrical connection point for a computing device of said first user and a second communication link to the remote transmitter, said system adapted to provide the first and second communication links simultaneously."

Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 1. Specifically, Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest an integrated telephone system that includes a first terminal for connecting a telephone

handset and adapted to provide a first communication link from the telephone handset to a remote transmitter. Additionally, Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest an integrated telephone system that additionally includes a second terminal for connecting a computing device and adapted to provide a second communication link to the remote transmitter. Furthermore, Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest an integrated phone system that provides the first and second communication link simultaneously.

Rather, Hughes et. al. describes a mobile telephone apparatus comprising a transceiver unit 10, an antenna 14, a handset connector port 16, a microphone port 18, a loud speaker port 20, an M-bus port 22 and a power connector port 24. Additionally, Hughes et. al. describes that users of the mobile telephone apparatus will not require the use of all such components at the same time. Thus, Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest a first and second communication link simultaneously connecting a telephone handset and a computing device to a remote transmitter.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is patentable over Hughes et. al.. Claim 2 depends directly from amended Claim 1. When the recitations of Claim 2 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claim 2 is likewise patentable over Hughes et. al..

Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the §102(b) rejection of Claims 1 and 2 be withdrawn.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

1. Claims 3 and 4 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hughes et al in view of Perlman (U.S. Patent No. 5,558,339). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 3 and 4 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 1. Claim 1 has been amended as set forth above. As set forth above, Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 1. Additionally, Perlman does not describe, show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 1. Rather, Perlman describes an apparatus and system for recording and replaying the interaction

between a plurality of players of a video game. Therefore, neither Hughes et. al. nor Perlman describe, show or suggest the features recited in amended Claim 1.

Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended Claim 1 is patentable over Hughes et. al. in view of Perlman. When the recitations of Claims 3 and 4 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 1, Applicant submits that Claims 3 and 4 are likewise patentable over Hughes et. al. in view of Perlman.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of Claims 3 and 4 be withdrawn.

2. Claims 5-7 and 13-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et. al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,652,792) in view of Hughes et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,708,706). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As amended Claim 5 recites, "A seat mounted to a vehicle, said seat comprising: an integrated telephone system comprising: a cradle mounted in a recessed portion of the seat; a first terminal adapted to have a communication connection to a communication device and to provide a first communication link to a transmitter located remotely from said cradle, said first terminal located on said cradle; and a second terminal adapted to have communication connection to a first computing device of a first user and to provide a second communication link to the transmitter, said second terminal located on said cradle, said integrated telephone system adapted to provide said first and second communication links simultaneously."

Neither Gallagher et. al. nor Hughes et. al. describe show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 5. Particularly, Claim 5 has been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations set forth above in amended Claim 1. As set forth above Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant submits that Hughes et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 5. Additionally, Gallagher et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the elements recited in amended Claim 5. Rather, Gallagher et. al. describes a cradle having a depression configured to receive a handset and a latching mechanism having two detents for retaining the handset in a secured position. Thus, neither Gallagher et. al. nor Hughes et. al. describe, show or suggest the features recited in amended Claim 5.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Hughes et. al..

Claims 6, 7 and 13-15 depend, either directly or indirectly, from amended Claim 5. When the recitations of Claims 6, 7 and 13-15 are considered in combination with the recitations of amended Claim 5, Applicant submits that Claims 6, 7 and 13-15 are likewise patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Hughes et. al..

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of Claims 5-7 and 13-15 and be withdrawn.

3. Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Caldwell. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 8 depends directly from Claim 5. As set forth above, Gallagher et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Additionally, Caldwell does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Rather, Caldwell describes a system and method in which a user is provided the option of automatic recall of selected numbers which have been previously called. Thus, neither Gallagher et. al. nor Caldwell describe, show or suggest the recitation of amended Claim 5.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Caldwell. When the recitations of Claim 8 are considered in combination with the recitation of amended Claim 5, Applicant submits that Claim 8 is likewise patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Caldwell.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of Claim 8 be withdrawn.

4. Claim 9 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Schlank et. al.. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 9 depends directly from Claim 5. As set forth above, Gallagher et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Additionally, Schlank et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Rather, Schlank et. al. describes a system for managing printing and scanning and faxing functionally of a facsimile machine via a bi-directional parallel interface. Thus,

neither Gallagher et. al. nor Schlank et. al. describe, show or suggest the recitation of amended Claim 5.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Schlank et. al.. When the recitations of Claim 9 are considered in combination with the recitation of amended Claim 5, Applicant submits that Claim 9 is likewise patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Schlank et. al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of Claim 9 be withdrawn.

5. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Burke et. al.. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 10 depends directly from Claim 5. As set forth above, Gallagher et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Additionally, Burke et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Rather, Burke et. al. describes a distributed processing telephone system for providing "plug-and-play" capability. Thus, neither Gallagher et. al. nor Burke et. al. describe, show or suggest the recitation of amended Claim 5.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Burke et. al.. When the recitations of Claim 10 are considered in combination with the recitation of amended Claim 5, Applicant submits that Claim 10 is likewise patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Burke et. al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of Claim 10 be withdrawn.

6. Claims 11 and 16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Croft et. al.. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 11 and 16 depend, either directly or indirectly, from Claim 5. As set forth above, Gallagher et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Additionally, Croft et. al. does not describe, show or suggest the recitations of amended Claim 5. Rather, Croft et. al. describes an improved electrical connection system for use in a communications card for interfacing a media connector of an

unknown media with a computer. Thus, neither Gallagher et. al. nor Croft et. al. describe, show or suggest the recitation of amended Claim 5.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 5 is patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Croft et. al.. When the recitations of Claims 11 and 16 are considered in combination with the recitation of amended Claim 5, Applicant submits that Claims 11 and 16 are likewise patentable over Gallagher et. al. in view of Croft et. al.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the §103 rejection of Claims 11 and 16 be withdrawn.

#### CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/26/04

By: Scott T. Gray  
Scott. T. Gray, Reg. No. 48,981

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600